

Appln No. 10/685,455  
 Andt. Dated February 18, 2005  
 Response to Office action of January 25, 2005

8

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant has amended Pages 1 and 2 of the Specification and the co-pending application numbers where applicable. The Applicant submits that these amendments introduce no new matter.

#### Claims

The Examiner rejected claims 1-35. By the present amendment claims 1 and 12 have been amended and claims 16-17 and 32-33 have been cancelled. Therefore claims 15-18, 31, and 34-35 are pending in the present application.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-35 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of Wolff et al (US Patent 6,081,261) in view of Patterson, Jr. et al (US Patent 5,797,002) in view of Bennett et al (US Patent 5,051,736) and in view of official notice. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner appears to have accepted the applicants' previous arguments distinguishing the present claims from Wolff et al in view of Patterson, Jr. et al. However the Examiner conducted a further search and now again rejects all of the pending claims by adding the reference to Bennett et al.

The Applicants assert that the Bennet et al. reference in combination with the previous references still does not teach the claimed invention. Bennet et al disclose a transparent plastic or glass tablet including various layers (40, 42) on which are inscribed position indicating coordinates. The claimed invention however combines much of the functionality described in the three references cited by the Examiner in individual coded sheets of paper called netpages, which are very different from the devices and methods described in the cited references. The transparent plastic or glass tablet including various layers (40, 42) on which are inscribed position indicating coordinates of Bennet et al., is not analogous and does not suggest the invisible coded data of the presently amended claims that are printed substantially simultaneously with visible information on a paper form.

The Applicants have not objected to the official notice of the Examiner that simply printing coded data on a surface, which data are substantially invisible in the visible spectrum, is well-known in the art. However, the present amended claims do not claim the simple act of printing invisible coded data; rather, the presently amended claims include the limitation that "*the visible information and the invisible coded data are printed substantially simultaneously and wherein at the time of printing a computer system associates the type and spatial extent of the coded data with the spatial extent of at least some of the visible information.*" The Applicants assert that such automatic association between visible information and invisible coded data is novel and non-obvious over all of the prior art and the official notice cited by the Examiner.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Appln No. 10/685,455  
 Andt. Dated February 18, 2005  
 Response to Office action of January 25, 2005

9

Wolff et al cannot disclose or suggest the above limitation because the spatial extent of the coded data of Wolff et al is only obtained through use of position-indicating gyroscopes and accelerometers. Patterson, Jr. et al cannot disclose or suggest the above limitation because the forms of Patterson, Jr. et al are only electronic forms and are not printed. Bennett et al cannot disclose or suggest the above limitation because the fact that the tablet including the various layers (40, 42) of Bennett et al is physically separate from any sheets including visible information, means that at the time of printing, visible information there cannot be any association between the spatial extent of the coded data on the layers (40, 42) and the visible extent of the coded information. Further, the above claim limitation of the present amendment distinguishes the present invention over other prior art of record that is not relied upon such as the reference to Dymetman, M., and Copperman, M., "Intelligent Paper in Electronic Publishing, Audio Imaging, and Digital Typography," Proceedings of EP '98, March/April 1998, Springer-Verlag LNCS 1375, pp. 392-406. Dymetman et al teaches position-indicating invisible coded data that are pre-printed in bulk on paper sheets, where the sheets are then used by a publisher who prints visible information on the sheets and manually associates the invisible coded data with the visible information.

The Applicants assert that the claim limitations added by the present amendment define significant and valuable commercial advantages over the prior art, which advantages are clearly recited in the specification. For example, the specification as filed at page 11, lines 22-23, states that interactive pages of the present invention "... are pages of text, graphics and images printed on ordinary paper, but which work like interactive web pages." The conveniences of such interactive pages--which can be printed quickly by a single printer--were not possible using the systems and methods of the prior art.

Support for the present amendments is found throughout the specification as originally filed. For example, the substantially simultaneous printing of visible inks and invisible infrared inks is found in the specification as filed at page 26, lines 6-8: "This printer simultaneously prints cyan, magenta, yellow, black, and infrared inks as well as paper conditioner and ink fixative." Further, support for the limitation concerning the association in the computer system of the spatial extent of the visible information and the invisible coded data is found in the specification as filed at page 12, lines 4-11: "The netpage consists of graphic data 2 printed using visible ink, and coded data 3 printed as a collection of tags 4 using invisible ink. The corresponding page description 5, stored on the netpage network, describes the individual elements of the netpage. In particular it describes the type and spatial extent (zone) of each interactive element (i.e. text field or button in the example), to allow the netpage system to correctly interpret input via the netpage. The submit button 6, for example, has a zone 7 which corresponds to the spatial extent of the corresponding graphic 8."

The Applicants assert that the rejections of the remaining dependent claims are now moot in light of the above amendments to the independent claims. Thus the Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:

*P. Lapstun*

PAUL LAPSTUN

Appln No. 10/685,455  
Amdt. Dated February 18, 2005  
Response to Office action of January 25, 2005

10

*J. Lapstun*  
JACQUELINE ANNE L APSTUN

*Kia S.*  
KIA SILVERBROOK  
Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041 Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +612 9555 7762

BEST AVAILABLE COPY